

May 5, 1981

LB 257

using energy most efficiently and it is time we realize there is an energy shortage of fossil fuels and it is time we get at the business and it is time we offer some stimulation to people to help them do their jobs and they know they have to have it done. The Energy Office audits all these buildings. They most of them have been audited and contrary to what you might not believe, the public schools have been sort of the leaders in this area trying to bring about a more efficient use of energy. Probably do it better than the general public knows. So I would suggest to you...

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR KOCH: ...that you possibly at this time should not accept Senator Remmers' amendment, look at the amendment I am going to offer you because I think it is the best of both worlds and in the end we will all come out being a winner and nobody is going to suffer any of the consequences. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Are there any other lights on?

PRESIDENT: There are none. This is it. You are the last speaker.

SENATOR FOWLER: Okay, well I was going to call the question but there is no need for that.

PRESIDENT: All right, the question has been called for. Do I see five hands? I do. The question then is, shall debate cease. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Has everyone voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: 31 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, to cease debate.

PRESIDENT: The motion carries. Debate ceases. Senator Remmers, you may close on your motion to return.

SENATOR REMMERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, just a few brief comments. First, I do believe that I did not change the provisions of the DeCamp amendment that would put the entire 3% into this fund rather than the 1% I think as Senator Vard Johnson indicated, the whole 3% is included. As far as the question of constitutionality, I can't agree with this because the only thing I did about that part of the bill was to change the weatherization to the school aid fund and I can't see that that should make the bill unconstitutional. If it is, then it was unconstitutional before I believe. A few other points, again I